

On the Possibility of a New Boson X^0 (214 MeV) in $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\mu^+\mu^-$

N.G. Deshpande,¹ G. Eilam,^{1,2} and J. Jiang¹

¹*Institute for Theoretical Science, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403*

²*Department of Physics, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel*

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

Abstract

We consider the existence of the state X^0 (214 MeV) in $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\mu^+\mu^-$ decay found by the HyperCP collaboration. We assume that a fundamental spin zero boson X^0 coupled to quarks leads to flavor changing $s \rightarrow dX^0$ process. We estimate the scalar and pseudoscalar coupling constants by considering $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+X^0$ processes, and find that pseudoscalar coupling dominates. We then evaluate the branching ratios for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0X^0$, $\pi^+\pi^-X^0$ and $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^-X^0$ decays. All these rates are found to be in the measurable ranges. We also comment on X^0 coupling to muons and constraints from muon $g - 2$.

Recent search for the rare decay $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\mu^+\mu^-$ by the HyperCP collaboration [1] has found three events all clustered at the dimuon mass of approximately 214 MeV. The branching ratio based on these three events for the process $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\mu^+\mu^-$ is quoted as $(8.6_{-5.4}^{+6.6} \pm 5.5) \times 10^{-8}$. The Standard Model branching ratio for this process is dominated by long distance contributions [2], which are estimated to give a branching ratio between 1.6×10^{-8} to 9.0×10^{-8} , in agreement with the total rate, but not with the dimuon mass distribution. It is therefore intriguing to consider the possibility that the dimuon events seen by HyperCP collaboration are due to a hitherto unobserved new particle X^0 of mass 214 MeV. Indeed, the suggestion is made in Ref. [1] that if such a particle exists, the branching ratio for the process $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0$, assuming that X^0 decays predominantly into $\mu^+\mu^-$, is

$$\text{BR}(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0, X^0 \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) = (3.1_{-1.9}^{+2.4} \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-8}. \quad (1)$$

In this note we explore consequences of this assumption to other rare decays, and suggest ways to either confirm or refute this hypothesis. We shall adopt the central value of the branching ratio in Eq. (1) to obtain our estimates. All our estimates are subject to errors in Eq. (1), which are about 50% statistical and 60% systematic.

Our basic assumption is that there is a new spin zero boson X^0 of mass 214 MeV and its fundamental interaction is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = [\bar{d}(h_1 + h_2\gamma_5)sX^0 + h.c.] + \bar{\mu}(l_1 + il_2\gamma_5)\mu X^0. \quad (2)$$

There may be other interactions of X^0 with quarks and leptons, but we do not make any *a priori* assumptions about these, leaving them to be determined by future experiments. We first derive constraints on the flavor changing couplings h_1 and h_2 from the decays $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0$, and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+X^0$. We then calculated the expected rates for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-X^0$, $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0X^0$ and $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^-X^0$. All these rates are in the experimentally accessible ranges.

To relate $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0$ to the parameters in Eq. (2), we use matrix elements involved in hyperon semileptonic decays, and take divergences on both sides. We use the standard hypotheses of CVC and PCAC which are known to be excellent for the low energy processes. We find

$$\langle p | \bar{d}s | \Sigma^+ \rangle = f_1 \frac{m_{\Sigma^+} - m_p}{m_s - m_d} \bar{u}_p u_{\Sigma^+}, \quad (3)$$

and

$$\langle p | \bar{d}\gamma_5 s | \Sigma^+ \rangle = g_1 \frac{m_{K^0}^2}{m_{K^0}^2 - m_{X^0}^2} \frac{m_{\Sigma^+} + m_p}{m_s + m_d} \bar{u}_p \gamma_5 u_{\Sigma^+}, \quad (4)$$

where f_1 and g_1 are vector and axial vector form factors. For quark masses, we use, $m_d = 7 \text{ MeV}$ and $m_s = 140 \text{ MeV}$ and for proton and meson masses we use values from Ref. [3]. We have related g_3 that occurs in the axial current matrix element to g_1 using PCAC [4]. Further, $|f_1| = 1$ from CVC and $|g_1| = 0.33$ from Σ^- hyperon decay [3]. Hence, the $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0$ decay width is given by [4]

$$\Gamma(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0) = \frac{q(E_p + m_p)}{4\pi m_{\Sigma^+}}(|A|^2 + |B|^2), \quad (5)$$

where

$$A = \frac{f_1(m_{\Sigma^+} - m_p)}{m_s - m_d} h_1, \quad (6)$$

$$B = \frac{g_1 m_{K^0}^2}{m_{K^0}^2 - m_{X^0}^2} \frac{m_{\Sigma^+} + m_p}{m_s + m_d} \left(\frac{E_p - m_p}{E_p + m_p} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} h_2. \quad (7)$$

Here $q = \lambda^{1/2}(m_{\Sigma^+}^2, m_p^2, m_{X^0}^2)/(2m_{\Sigma^+})$ with $\lambda(x, y, z) \equiv (x - y - z)^2 - 4yz$, q is the magnitude of the final state momentum, and E_p is the proton energy in the rest frame of Σ^+ . Knowing the branching ratio of $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow pX^0$ [1], we get

$$|h_1|^2 + 0.19|h_2|^2 \simeq 9.14 \times 10^{-21}. \quad (8)$$

We now obtain a constraint on $h_1 \bar{s}dX^0$ coupling by considering the process $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ X^0$. Since K and π are both pseudoscalar, only the scalar coupling of X^0 is involved in this process. Again, taking the divergence of the vector current, we can evaluate the width as

$$\Gamma(K^+ \rightarrow \pi X^0) = \frac{1}{16\pi m_{K^+}^3} \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(m_{K^+}^2, m_{\pi}^2, m_{X^0}^2) \left(\frac{m_{K^+}^2 - m_{\pi}^2}{m_s - m_d} \right)^2 |h_1|^2. \quad (9)$$

Comparing this with the observed branching ratio for $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \mu^+ \mu^-$ of 8.1×10^{-8} [3], we obtain the constraint

$$|h_1| < 7.4 \times 10^{-12}. \quad (10)$$

This bound can be further improved by using the branching ratio for dimuons of invariant mass close to 214 MeV . We thus see that X^0 coupling to $\bar{s}d$ is predominantly of the pseudoscalar type and we have

$$|h_2| \gtrsim 3.6 \times 10^{-10}. \quad (11)$$

We have examined the consequences of X^0 exchange in K_L - K_S mass difference and the decay of $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$. With the above value of $|h_2|$, the contribution of X^0 to the mass

difference ΔM_K (using vacuum saturation) is about five orders of magnitude smaller than the experimental value. Similarly, using constraints on X^0 coupling to muons from $g - 2$, discussed later, we find $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decay branching ratio to be several orders of magnitude below the experimental value. Thus, the kaon mass difference and the $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ decay do not impose useful constraints.

We now discuss the decays $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- X^0$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 X^0$ which are sensitive to the pseudoscalar coupling. These decays have been discussed by Ref. [5] in the context of a chiral Lagrangian. The approximation made in Ref. [5] neglects momentum dependence of the matrix element. Instead we shall use experimental data on K_{e4} decays to estimate the decay rates.

In the decay $K^+(P + L) \rightarrow \pi^+(p_1) + \pi^-(p_2) + e^+(p_e) + \nu_e(p_\nu)$, the axial matrix element is given by [6]

$$m_K \langle \pi^+ \pi^- | A_\mu | K^+ \rangle = F P_\mu + G Q_\mu + R L_\mu \quad (12)$$

where $P = p_1 + p_2$, $Q = p_1 - p_2$, $L = p_e + p_\nu$ and the experimentally determined [7] form factors F and G are found to be insensitive to variation in $\pi\pi$ invariant mass, and we take the values to be $F = 5.832$ and $G = 4.703$. The form factor R is not accessible in the experiment. However, a reliable estimate is provided using current algebra and soft pion approximation [8]. The value of R for process $K_L(P + L) \rightarrow \pi^+(p_1) + \pi^-(p_2) + X^0(L)$ is found to be

$$R = \frac{m_K}{f_\pi} \frac{(P + L) \cdot p_2}{(P + L) \cdot P}, \quad (13)$$

where the definition of P and Q stay the same as above, while L is now the momentum of X^0 . Using $SU(2)$ symmetry, and taking divergence of the current, we have for the matrix element for K_L decay

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{\sqrt{2} \text{Re} h_2 [F(P \cdot L) + G(Q \cdot L) + R L^2]}{m_K(m_s + m_d)} \quad (14)$$

We then integrated over the final state phase space and find the branching ratios to be $\text{BR}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- X^0) = 1.54 \times 10^{-9}$ and $\text{BR}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 X^0) = 8.02 \times 10^{-9}$. The enhancement in the decay to π^0 is due to the larger final state phase space. Both these branching ratios are large enough to be measured in K_L decays. Compared to the rates estimated using Ref. [5], our results are about a factor of 5 smaller.

From the h_2 value, we can also predict the branching ratio of $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- X^0$ decay. We again consider the semileptonic process $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^0 + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$ [9] and take the divergence of

the axial current. We find the matrix element for $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- X^0$ is

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{C_A h_2}{m_s + m_d} \bar{u}_{\Xi^-} k_\mu u_{\Omega^-}^\mu, \quad (15)$$

where $C_A = -2.08$ [9], and k_μ is four momentum of X^0 . Utilizing the projection operator for spin-3/2 fields

$$\Lambda_{\mu\nu}(p) = (\not{p} + M) \left(-g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu + \frac{2p_\mu p_\nu}{3M^2} - \frac{p_\mu \gamma_\nu - p_\nu \gamma_\mu}{3M} \right), \quad (16)$$

the $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- X^0$ decay width is evaluated to be

$$\Gamma(\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- X^0) = \frac{|h_2|^2 C_A^2}{192\pi m_{\Omega^-}^5 (m_s + m_d)^2} \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}(m_{\Omega^-}^2, m_{\Xi^-}^2, m_{X^0}^2) [(m_{\Omega^-} + m_{\Xi^-})^2 - m_{X^0}^2], \quad (17)$$

The branching ratio we get is 2.1×10^{-6} , which is accessible at the HyperCP experiment.

Assuming X^0 couples to $\bar{\mu}\mu$ as in Eq. (2), it will contribute to the muon $g - 2$. From Ref. [11], we find

$$\Delta a_\mu = \frac{m_\mu^2}{8\pi^2} \int_0^1 x^2 dx \frac{l_1^2(2-x) - l_2^2 x}{m_\mu^2 x^2 + m_{X^0}^2(1-x)}. \quad (18)$$

By requiring the X^0 contribution be smaller than the difference between the experimental value and the theoretical prediction, *i.e.*, $\Delta a_\mu < 250 \times 10^{-11}$ [10], and assuming the X^0 is either a pure scalar S^0 or a pure pseudoscalar P^0 , we can constraint the couplings $l_1 < 8.6 \times 10^{-4}$ and $l_2 < 1.0 \times 10^{-3}$. The decay widths of S^0 and P^0 to $\bar{\mu}\mu$ are given

$$\Gamma(S^0 \rightarrow \bar{\mu}\mu) = \frac{l_1^2 m_{X^0}}{8\pi} \left(1 - \frac{4m_\mu^2}{m_{X^0}^2} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad (19)$$

$$\Gamma(P^0 \rightarrow \bar{\mu}\mu) = \frac{l_2^2 m_{X^0}}{8\pi} \left(1 - \frac{4m_\mu^2}{m_{X^0}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (20)$$

Hence the derived decay widths are $\Gamma_S < 1.58 \times 10^{-11} \text{ GeV}$ ($c\tau_S > 12\mu m$) and $\Gamma_P < 1.6 \times 10^{-9} \text{ GeV}$ ($c\tau_P > 0.16\mu m$). Unless the Γ_S is more than an order of magnitude smaller than the above limit, these lifetimes are too short to be observed as displaced vertices. If $\text{BR}(X^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$ is less than 100%, then the total width would be larger and the lifetime shorter.

Although we have assumed the branching ratio of 100% to $\mu^+ \mu^-$, our predictions for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- X^0$, $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 X^0$ and $\Omega^- \rightarrow \Xi^- X^0$ with subsequent decay $X^0 \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ do not change, if the branching ratio is smaller. The reason is that an increase in the coupling constant h_2 compensates exactly for the decrease in the branching ratio. At present there

does not seem to be any evidence for the decays $X^0 \rightarrow e^+e^-$, $X^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, or $X^0 \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$. It would be interesting to obtain experimental limits on these processes to further understand the properties of X^0 .

We have taken a purely phenomenological approach to the existence of a particle X^0 . The possibility of a light, weakly interacting scalar or pseudoscalar boson has been considered in the context of supersymmetry in models of spontaneous supersymmetry breaking [12, 13, 14, 15]. Specific effects in K decays due to pseudoscalar bosons are studied in Ref. [5] and the contributions to muon $g - 2$ are discussed in Ref. [16]. Such particles can also arise in theories of broken family symmetries and are known as familons [17]. The coupling constants in such theories are usually arbitrary and an analysis like ours is useful in constraining the couplings.

In conclusion, we are unable to rule out the existence of X^0 particle based on present data. We have suggested signals for this particle to be observed in K_L and Ω^- decays. We believe the branching ratios for the proposed processes are large enough to verify existence of X^0 or to rule it out. Confirmation of this boson would be evidence of physics beyond the Standard Model.

Note added: As we were ready to submit our manuscript, we received a communication from Xiao-Gang He that He, Tandean and Valencia had submitted Ref. [18] to the arXiv, which studies some of the same processes involving X^0 .

Acknowledgments

We thank Xiao-Gang He for useful correspondence. GE would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for partial support. This research was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under Grants No. DE-FG02-96ER40969.

-
- [1] H. Park *et al.* [HyperCP Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 021801 (2005).
 - [2] X. G. He, J. Tandean and G. Valencia, arXiv:hep-ph/0506067.
 - [3] S. Eidelman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Phys. Lett. B **592** (2004) 1.
 - [4] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B. R. Holstein, Camb. Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **2**, 1 (1992).

- [5] D. S. Gorbunov and V. A. Rubakov, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 054008 (2001).
- [6] B. R. Wienke and N. G. Deshpande, Phys. Rev. D **5**, 725 (1972).
- [7] S. Pislak *et al.* [BNL-E865 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 221801 (2001).
- [8] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 616 (1966).
- [9] J. Finjord and M. K. Gaillard, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 778 (1980).
- [10] For a recent review, see A. Czarnecki, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **144**, 201 (2005).
- [11] R. Jackiw and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **5**, 2396 (1972); J. P. Leveille, Nucl. Phys. B **137**, 63 (1978).
- [12] J. R. Ellis, K. Enqvist and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **147**, 99 (1984); J. R. Ellis, K. Enqvist and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **151**, 357 (1985).
- [13] T. Bhattacharya and P. Roy, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 2284 (1988).
- [14] G. F. Giudice and R. Rattazzi, Phys. Rept. **322**, 419 (1999).
- [15] D. S. Gorbunov, Nucl. Phys. B **602**, 213 (2001).
- [16] A. Brignole, E. Perazzi and F. Zwirner, JHEP **9909**, 002 (1999).
- [17] F. Wilczek, NSF-ITP-84-14; D. Chang and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Lett. B **188**, 231 (1987); J. L. Feng, T. Moroi, H. Murayama and E. Schnapka, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 5875 (1998).
- [18] X. G. He, J. Tandean and G. Valencia, arXiv:hep-ph/0509041.